

## **Remarks**

Claims 1-11 and 13-21 are pending. Claims 1-11 and 13-21 are rejected.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,687,506 (Carballo). Claims 4-9, 11-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carballo in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,687,506 (Girod). Claims 10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carballo in view of Girod in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,570,689 (Kushita).

With regard to claim 1, Carballo does not teach broadcasting the plurality of noise signals from different locations into the region such that telecommunications is inhibited in the overlap of the broadcasted noise signals. Rather, an interference signal emitted by an emitter of Carballo disables particular signaling channels of a base station:

For each interference signal, an interference generator EMITTER (10), such as the one in FIG. 2, is necessary.

Col. 2, ll. 36-37 (emphasis added).

The disabler also includes a pair of antennas: a) An IN (receiving) antenna (1), to receive base station carriers [and] [a]n OUT (emitting) antenna (11), to emit interference signals.

Col. 2, ll. 59-63.

In basic embodiments, the disabler may be used in areas that receive carriers from only a single base station. In this case, one of those carriers contains signaling channels, and therefore only a single interference generator module EMITTER (10) is necessary.

In places that receive several carriers from different base stations, the system may have a single MODECON (2) module and as many interference generator modules EMITTER (10) as necessary.

Col. 2, l. 66 - col. 3, l. 7 (emphasis added).

Carballo simply does not address overlap of its interference signals. Moreover, to confine the influence of its disabler, Carballo uses directive antennas or a higher carrier-to-interference ratio at the input of an external mobile terminal, not overlap of broadcasted interference signals:

As an additional safeguard, directive antennas can be used to confine the influence of the disabler inside the target area.

Col. 2, ll. 64-65 (emphasis added).

It is desirable to ensure that the disabler will not affect mobile terminals located outside the target area. The interference level emitted by the disabler is related to the carrier level as received inside the target area, with the interference level being sufficiently high that terminals are disabled. The system should not interfere with mobile terminals located outside the target area. To achieve this, the carrier-to-interference ratio at the input of an external mobile terminal,  $K_r$ , should be typically 20 dB higher than the same ratio for a terminal inside the enclosed target area.

Col. 3, ll. 8-16 (emphasis added).

With regard to claim 13, for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1, Carballo does not teach a plurality of antennas, each antenna in communication with one of the generators, each antenna having an antenna coverage area, the limited region of the telecommunications coverage formed by overlapping antenna coverage areas.

The dependent claims are patentable at least because they depend from one of the independent claims.

Applicants' Attorney believes the claims are in a condition for allowance. Applicants' Attorney respectfully requests a notice to that effect. Applicants' Attorney also invites a telephone conference if Examiner believes it will advance the prosecution of this case.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to Deposit Account Number 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

**BRIAN L. AREND ET AL.**

By /Benjamin C. Stasa/  
Benjamin C. Stasa  
Reg. No. 55,644  
Attorney for Applicants

Date: June 28, 2007

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351